

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION**

DAVID OSWALT,

Plaintiff.

CASE NO.:

v.

MONITRONICS SECURITY, LP a/k/a MONI  
SMART SECURITY.

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

COMES NOW, Plaintiff, DAVID OSWALT, by and through the undersigned counsel, and sues Defendant, MONITRONICS SECURITY LP A/K/A MONI SMART SECURITY, and in support thereof respectfully alleges violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 *et seq.* (“TCPA”).

**INTRODUCTION**

1. The TCPA was enacted to prevent companies like Defendant from invading American citizen’s privacy and to prevent abusive “robo-calls.”

2. “The TCPA is designed to protect individual consumers from receiving intrusive and unwanted telephone calls.” *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740 (2012).

3. “Senator Hollings, the TCPA’s sponsor, described these calls as ‘the scourge of modern civilization, they wake us up in the morning; they interrupt our dinner at night; they force the sick and elderly out of bed; they hound us until we want to rip the telephone out of the wall.’ 137 Cong. Rec. 30, 821 (1991). Senator Hollings presumably intended to give telephone

subscribers another option: telling the auto-dialers to simply stop calling.” *Osorio v. State Farm Bank, F.S.B.*, 746 F.3d 1242, 1256 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2014).

4. According to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), “Unwanted calls and texts are the number one complaint to the FCC. There are thousands of complaints to the FCC every month on both telemarketing and robocalls. The FCC received more than 215,000 TCPA complaints in 2014.” *Fact Sheet: Wheeler Proposal to Protect and Empower Consumers Against Unwanted Robocalls, Texts to Wireless Phones*, Federal Communications Commission, (May 27, 2015), [https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs\\_public/attachmatch/DOC-333676A1.pdf](https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-333676A1.pdf).

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

5. Jurisdiction and venue for purposes of this action are appropriate and conferred by 28 U.S.C. § 1331, Federal Question Jurisdiction, as this action involves violations of the TCPA.

6. Subject matter jurisdiction, federal question jurisdiction, for purposes of this action is appropriate and conferred by 28 U.S.C. § 1331, which provides that the district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States; and this action involves violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii). See *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*, S.Ct. 740, 748 (2012) and *Osorio v. State Farm Bank, F.S.B.*, 746 F.3d 1242, 1256 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2014).

7. The alleged violations described herein occurred in Dallas County, Texas. Accordingly, venue is appropriate with this Court under 28 U.S.C. §1391(b)(2), as it is the judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to this action occurred.

**FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

8. Plaintiff is a natural person, and citizen of the State of Texas, residing in Dallas County, Texas.

9. Plaintiff is the “called party.” See *Breslow v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, 755 F. 3d 1265 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2014) and *Osorio v. State Farm Bank, F.S.B.*, 746 F.3d 1242 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2014).

10. Defendant is a corporation which was formed in Texas with its principal place of business located at 1990 Wittington Pl Farmers Branch, Texas who conducts business through their registered agent C T Corporation System at 1999 Bryan Street, Suite 900 Dallas, Texas 75201.

11. Defendant called Plaintiff approximately one hundred (100) times in an attempt to collect alleged debt.

12. Upon information and belief, some or all of the calls Defendant made to Plaintiff’s cellular telephone number were made using an “automatic telephone dialing system” which has the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers to be called, using a random or sequential number generator (including but not limited to a predictive dialer) or an artificial or prerecorded voice; and to dial such numbers as specified by 47 U.S.C § 227(a)(1) (hereinafter “auto-dialer calls”). Plaintiff will testify that he knew it was an auto-dialer because of the vast number of calls he received and because he heard a pause when he answered his telephone before a voice came on the line from Defendant.

13. Upon Receipt of the calls from Defendant, Plaintiff’s caller ID identified the calls were being initiated from, but not limited to, the following telephone number: (844) 422-7849.

14. Plaintiff is the subscriber, regular user and carrier of the cellular telephone number (662)\*\*\*-3878, and was the called party and recipient of Defendant’s calls.

15. Defendant placed an exorbitant amount of automated calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone (662) \*\*\*-3878 in an attempt to reach the individual known only as "Betty".

16. Plaintiff does not currently have any account or business dealings with Defendant.

17. On several occasions over the last four (4) years, Plaintiff instructed Defendant agent(s) to stop calling his cellular telephone.

18. In or about September of 2017, Plaintiff received a telephone call to his aforementioned cellular telephone number from Defendant seeking to recover a debt from an individual known only as "Betty". Plaintiff spoke to an agent/representative of Defendant and informed them that he is not the individual they are calling for. Plaintiff demanded a cessation of all calls to his cellular telephone.

19. Due to the tremendous volume of calls Plaintiff received over a lengthy period of time, he was not able to properly catalogue each and every call. However attached hereto as Exhibit A is a small sampling of some of the automated calls Plaintiff received to his cellular telephone from Defendant.

20. Defendant has a corporate policy to use an automatic telephone dialing system or a pre-recorded or artificial voice to individuals just as they did to Plaintiff's cellular telephone in this case.

21. Defendant has a corporate policy to use an automatic telephone dialing system or a pre-recorded or artificial voice, just as they did to the Plaintiff's cellular telephone in this case, with no way for the consumer, or Defendant to remove the number.

22. Defendant corporate policy is structured so as to continue to call individuals like Plaintiff, despite these individuals explaining to Defendant they do not wish to be called.

23. Defendant has numerous other federal lawsuits pending against them alleging similar violations as stated in this Complaint.

24. Defendant has numerous complaints against it across the country asserting that its automatic telephone dialing system continues to call despite being requested to stop.

25. Defendant has had numerous complaints against it from consumers across the country asking to not be called, however Defendant continues to call these individuals.

26. Defendant corporate policy provided no means for Plaintiff or Defendant to have Plaintiff's number removed from Defendant call list.

27. Defendant has a corporate policy to harass and abuse individuals despite actual knowledge the called parties do not wish to be called.

28. Not one of Defendant telephone calls placed to Plaintiff were for "emergency purposes" as specified in 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).

29. Defendant willfully and knowingly violated the TCPA with respect to Plaintiff.

30. From each and every call placed without express consent by Defendant to Plaintiff's cellular telephone, Plaintiff suffered the injury of invasion of privacy and the intrusion upon his right of seclusion.

31. From each and every call without express consent placed by Defendant to Plaintiff's cellular telephone, Plaintiff suffered the injury of the occupation of his cellular telephone line and cellular telephone by unwelcome calls, making the telephone unavailable for legitimate callers or outgoing calls while the telephone was ringing from Defendant call.

32. From each and every call placed without express consent by Defendant to Plaintiff's cellular telephone, Plaintiff suffered the injury of unnecessary expenditure of his time. For calls he answered, the time he spent on the call was unnecessary as he repeatedly asked for

the calls to stop. Even for unanswered calls, Plaintiff had to waste time to unlock the telephone and deal with missed call notifications and call logs that reflect the unwanted calls. This also impaired the usefulness of these features of Plaintiff's cellular telephone, which are designed to inform the user of important missed communications.

33. Each and every call placed without express consent by Defendant to Plaintiff's cellular telephone was an injury in the form of a nuisance and annoyance to the Plaintiff. For calls that were answered, Plaintiff had to go to the unnecessary trouble of answering them. Even for unanswered calls, Plaintiff had to waste time to unlock the telephone and deal with missed call notifications and call logs that reflected the unwanted calls. This also impaired the usefulness of these features of Plaintiff's cellular telephone, which are designed to inform the user of important missed communications.

34. Each and every call placed without express consent by Defendant to Plaintiff's cellular telephone resulted in the injury of unnecessary expenditure of Plaintiff's cellular telephone's battery power.

35. Each and every call placed without express consent by Defendant to Plaintiff's cellular telephone where a voice message was left which occupied space in Plaintiff's telephone or network.

36. Each and every call placed without express consent by Defendant to Plaintiff's cellular telephone resulted in the injury of a trespass to Plaintiff's chattel, namely his cellular telephone and his cellular telephone services.

37. As a result of the calls described above, Plaintiff suffered an invasion of privacy. Plaintiff was also affect in a personal and individualized way by stress, distress and aggravation.

**COUNT I**  
**(Violation of the TCPA)**

38. Plaintiff fully incorporates and re-alleges paragraphs one (1) through thirty seven (37) as if fully set forth herein.

39. Defendant willfully violated the TCPA with respect to Plaintiff, specifically for each of the auto-dialer calls made to Plaintiff's cellular telephone after Plaintiff notified Defendant that Plaintiff wished for the calls to stop

40. Defendant repeatedly placed non-emergency telephone calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone using an automatic telephone dialing system or prerecorded or artificial voice without Plaintiff's prior express consent in violation of federal law, including 47 U.S.C § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff respectfully demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable and judgment against MONITRONICS SECURITY LP A/K/A MONI SMART SECURITY for statutory damages, punitive damages, actual damages, treble damages, enjoinder from further violations of these parts and any other such relief the court may deem just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Joshua R. Kersey  
Texas Bar No.: 24090206  
Morgan & Morgan, Tampa, P.A.  
201 North Franklin Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Tampa, FL 33602  
Telephone: (813) 225-5505  
Facsimile: (813) 222-2490  
Primary Email: JKersey@ForThePeople.com  
Secondary Email: MMartinez@ForThePeople.com  
*Attorney for Plaintiff*

